WITNES SES

De Cense! Witnesses	Page
KONOYE, Mrs. Yasuko (resumed)	37501
Redirect by Mr. Comyns Carr	37501
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	37505
Redirect (cont'd) by Mr. Comyns Carr	37509
Questions by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	37512
Redirect (cont'd) by Mr. Comyns Carr	37513
Recross by Mr. Brooks	37518
MORNING RECESS	37525
(Witness excused)	37534
NOON RECESS	37544

Of

EXHIBITS

	Doc. No.	Def. No.	Pros. No.	Description	For Ident.E	In vidence
				Correction as to Exhib No. 3751 marked yester day for Identification	• /	
	3150-378		3751	Photostatic Copy of the original SAIO HARADA Memoirs	NJI- 37548	
10	3150-378	-В	3751-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 378 (pp. 2974-7)		37548
	3150-2		3754	The SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs	37560	
	3150-2A		3754-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chepter 2 (pp. 7-8)		37560
	3150-2B		3754-D	The SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs - Chapter 2 (p.8)		37567
	3150-8		3755	The SAIONJI_HARADA Memoirs	37569	
	3150-8A		3755-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 8 (pp. 47-48)		37565
	3150-10		3756	The SAIØNJI-HARADA Memoirs	37571	
	3150-10A		3756-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 10 (p. 53)	,	37571
AFTERNOON RECESS						37573

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH	ef. Pros.	Description	For In Ident.Evidence
3150-11	3757	The SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs	37574
3150-11A	3757-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 11 (pp. 74-5)	37575
3150-118	3757 - B	Excerpt from the SAIONJI_HARADA Memoirs - Chapter 11 (pp. 77-8)	37577
3150-12	3758	The SAIONJI_HARADA Memoirs	37579
3150-12A	3758-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 12 (pp. 85-9)	37579
3150-13	3759	The SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs	37586
3150-133	3759-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 13 (p. 102)	37586
3150-14	3760	The SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs	37589
3150-14A	3760-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 14 (p.106)	37589
3150-15-16	3761	The SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs	37591

of .

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. Def.		Description	For In Ident Evidence
3150-15-16A	3761-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 15 and 16 (p. 135)	37591
3150-3€	3762	The SAIONJI-HARADA Yemoirs	37598
3150-36A	3762-A	Excerpt therefrom - Chapter 36 (pp. 286-7)	37598

Friday, 16 January 1948

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

at 0930. Appearances:

10 11

12

9

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,

For the Tribunal, all Members present, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE HENRI BERNARD, Member from the Republic of France, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting from 1100 to 1600.

> For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL

FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building

Tokyo, Japan

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Lefler & Wolf

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except SHIRATORI who is represented by counsel. The Sugamo prison surgeon certifies that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

bir. Comyns Carr.

9

11

12

13

14

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

YASUKO KONOYE, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Q Mrs. KONOYE, you told my friend, Mr. Logan, that on the whole the dictations were taken once or twice a week. Can you give us any idea how often, say in a year, the intervals were longer than that?

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, it is a waste of time to ask questions like hat. The witness has already answered that question yesterday; she said she didn't know.

THE PRESIDENT: I really think we have heard enough about the intervals and those matters, Mr. Carr.

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Now, when Mr. Logan put a question, which I think was ambiguous and I want to tear it up completely: Does the diary or memoirs, of which we have the photostatic copy here, incorporate any alterations whatever by the Mr. SATOMI about whom you were asked?

THE PRESIDENT: In the last answer she said they did, but I think we would like it cleared up.

There is an apparent contradiction. I think we have different views of what she really said, depending upon the meaning of the word "document."

LR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may I be heard on this?

THE PRESIDENT: We want it cleared up, Mr. Logan. We will give permission, if necessary.

THE PRESIDENT: We want Mr. Carr to clear t up. We want Mr. Carr to put that question. If h

LOGAN: If the Tribunal please --

does not, we will, and we will do it now.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, throughout this trial this Tribunal has consistently ruled on objections by Mr. Carr that we could not ask any questions to contradict or try to get a witness to change his story. Now, this is quite clear --

1

2

8

10

11 12

13

14

16

18

17

19 20

21

22

23

you

5

2

8

9

11

13 14

16

15

17 18

19

21

22

23

25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan, I already told you that the Judges differ as to whether there was a contradiction and it must be cleared up. Some Judges take your view; I am one of them. Others do not. And obviously it is a matter that must be cleared up.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I haven't even expressed my view yet. I would like to find out -- it may obviate the necessity of asking this witness questions just to show how clear it does appear in this record -- just what she did mean.

THE PRESIDENT: I know what you mean. Clear as it appears to me and perhaps to other Judges, it is not so clear to the remainder.

MR. LOGAN: Well, for the purposes of my objection, may I have a ruling on it?

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q What is the answer, Mrs. KONOYE? Does the document, as we have it here, contain any corrections or alterations by SATOMI?

A No, they are not included or incorporated.

THE MONITOR: Strike out "incorporated"; she merely said "It is not in there."

Will ask the witness to answer it again, interpreter.

1

5

4

7 8

9

10

12 13

> 14 15

16

18

21

22

20

23 24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Refer her to the answer of yesterday, the last one; the one upon which Mr. Logan obviously relies. It is at page 37,489.

Q You were asked this yesterday, Mrs. KONOYE, at page 37,489 or -488, the bottom, "On what document did SATOMI's corrections appear?" And you said: "I rewrote the document which HARADA had taken to SAIONJI for correction, and SATOMI corrected the rewritten copy of that document.

"Q And then did you rewrite it again?
"A Yes."

And then, reading one question earlier, the bottom of -488: "You just said, Mrs. KONOYE, that SATOMI's corrections do not appear on that document. To what document are you referring?

"A To the manuscript which HARADA took to SAIONJI "or correction."

Then it goes on as I read.

Then the last question is at the top of 37,490:

"You state in your affidavit as follows: 'I have been shown by Mr. J. G. Lambert, IPS Investigator, a photostatic copy of this finished transcription which I recognize as the memoirs of Baron HARADA written by me in my own handwriting.' Is that photostatic

copy that you saw a copy of the document you just spoke about?

"A Yes."

THE PRESIDENT: I will put the next question.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, before

asking the question --

THE PRESIDENT: You cannot interrupt. I said I would put a question and I am not going to allow you to interrupt any Judge.

Now, is the copy of the document, which you refer to there in your answer, the copy rewritten by you after SATOMI had made corrections?

THE WITNESS: Not so.

MR. LOGAN: May I say something now, if the Tribunal please?

THE PRESIDENT: You may object at any stage, but not to what a Judge is going to ask.

bunal please, that the method in which Mr. Carr read these questions by taking the middle questions and then a previous one and then one subsequent and superimposed on the question which your Honor has asked this witness, and I don't follow it myself. I don't know what document is being referred to. It isn't in the transcript.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honors please, I would like to enter an objection because, as I tried to point out yesterday -- I think maybe the Court will see it now -there may be two original documents, and there has been no document shown or identified. I understand they are so large they couldn'; be brought into the courtroom, and I don't see how they could have beer shown to this witness. I can't find from the prosecution the location of what they say is the original. Now, I am not talking about the original of the photostat, necessarily, which is in question, but I understand that the original that has been untampered with is available and could be obtained if proper search and request were made, and I say that that is the best evidence, and I would object to any document being offered under this witness' testimony as coming from a tampered document or from a document which has been corrected and changed as not being the best evidence.

DE DESTRUCTION

Ageinst a Common Plant William

18

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

23 24

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

19

18

interrupt.

20 21

22 23

24 25

It seems there is not only such a possible original but there are diaries upon which that is based that might be even better evidence yet. That is why I requested yesterday that the prosecution be required to produce such document or, at least, samples of the first and last copies so that I could cross-examine on them, and I ask the Court to reconsider my request at this time

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the witness was shown the whole of the photostatic copies when she identified them in her first affidavit ir this building. We have only brought into court those parts which we propose to use, but if the Court desires that the whole be brought into court, it is merely a question of labor in carrying it down and could be done quite easily.

(IIr. Brooks approached the lectern.) THE PRISIDENT: Now, Mr. Brooks, please do not

I think you said that these photostats were handed to the Clerk of the Court in the second half of last year, is that so?

MR. COMYNS CARR: No.

THE PRISIDENT: In August.

MR. COMYNS CARR: No, your Honor. What was handed to the Clerk of the Court was the complete

REDIRECT

English translation as prepared by SCAP. Owing to the fact that both parties required to work upon the Jananese photostats, those were retained upstairs in the Decument Division of the IPS and have been available for both parties to work on for translation ever since.

THI PRESIDENT: How long have the photostats

been available to the defense? IT. CCMYNS CARR: From the same date; August last year, your Honor; August 29.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the defense will be at liberty to point out in the photostats anything that SATOMI has written.

TR. CCMYNS CARR: With regard to the originals for which my friend, Fr. Brooks, is asking, as your Honor pointed out yesterday, the photostat is a precise reproduction of them and anything which can be deduced from any state of the text can equally well be done from the photostat as from the original.

But if the Tribunal thinks that anything would be gained by bringing the original or any part of it here, we will take steps to have it done.

THE PRESIDINT: We do not see any need to bring the whole or any part of it here yet.

NR. BROOKS: If Mr. Carr is through, I would like to be heard, because you are talking about the

6

7

8

9 10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

37,509

original. What original are you talking about? He talks about the original very glibly.

3 4 5

1

2

THE PRESIDENT: He will not make it any clearer if he is continually subjected to your interruntions. There is not any reason at all why he should not be allowed to complete his re-examination. You may approac the lectern with any application or request you think fit.

8

Proceed, Mr. Carr.

9

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I have approached the lectern with a request.

11

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr, will you put a question? If Er. Brooks objects, we will have to consider his objection.

13 14

15

16

17

TR. COLYNS CARR: Your Honor, if any Member of the Tribunal is still in doubt as to exactly what corrections were and what were not incorporated in the document which has been photostated, I should like to put a further question about it, but if all Members of the Tribunal are quite clear on that point, I will not do so.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Put the further question.

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Wrs. KOMOYE, in the Memoirs, as we have them photostated here, are there incorporated the corrections

IR. BROOKS: I wish to object, your Honor.

and alterations by Prince SAIONJI?

MR. BROOKS: I object, if your Honor please. There is no Memoir before the witness. If he is going to examine this witness on these Memoirs, I ask that they be properly identified and she has something in her hand to talk from. There is too much confusion on it.

THE PRESIDENT: Let her answer the question.

There are only a few corrections and additional notations by Prince SAIONJI, and I think they are to be found here and there.

8

9

10 11

13 14

15

12

16 17

18

19 20

23

24

25

21 22

But however many or few there are, are they incorporated in the Diary which you identified, and of which you can see a specimen if you like?

A I need not be shown the document.

Q Then what is the answer? Are such corrections as PAIONJI made incorporated in the document you saw here in this building and identified?

MR. BROOK: I object to that question as a leading question on a very important matter, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection overruled.

Then what do you say, Mrs. KONOYE? 6

With regard to whether or not Mr. SATOMI made any additional notations or not, I wish to say that the document which is in photostat form -the document from which the photostats were taken, . contained corrections and notations made by Prince SAIONJI. The corrections and notations made by SATOMI were made on a rewritten copy which I made on the basis of the document on which Prince FAIONJI made his corrections.

THE MONITOR: Correction to the last part: "SATOMI's corrections were made on another copy which I made from the original from which the photostat copies were made." And the witness continued to say

"Yesterday --", and she was interrupted.

THE PRESIDENT: Are these corrections in Prince SAIONJI's handwriting?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: I would like that last answer of the witness repeated. I would like it repeated very slewly.

(Whereupon, the last answer was read by the official court reporter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Were SATOMI's corrections made on the copy which was photostated?

THE WITNESS: No, there isn't any at all. What I said yesterday was that Mr. FATOMI made his corrections on a copy which I made myself from the original from which the photostat was made.

THE MONITOR: 'Was previously made."

THE PRESIDENT: That is clear enough.

MR. BROOKS: But, if your Honor please, you are assuming that she was present when the photostats were made.

THE MONITOR: Just a moment, please. Reporter, will you strike out the last correction of "previously", please? That should be out.

IR. BROOK: You can see the significance now of having before us to examine what was the original

HV.

6

5

1

2

.

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

because the man making a photostat is just taking a photograph. He doesn't know, since it is in Japanese, whose handwriting it is in, and she doesn't know just which one of these copies she is talking about was photographed. We can't tell from the photostat copy, if your Honor please, because, as the witness says, it has been rewritten twice and it would naturally, even after the corrections had been made, it would naturally appear in her handwriting, with only saionJi's corrections on it. It is no test.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr.

Tribunal wish any further clarification of that matter, or is it clear to everybody?

THE PRESIDENT: No member of the Tribunal desires any further clarification.

MR. COMYNE CARR: If the Tribunal please.
BY MR. COMYNE CARR:

Now, you were asked by Mr. Logan about the difficulty you had in transcribing Baron HARADA's dictation and finding out what was the subject of the sentence, and so on. When you had transcribed each portion and handed it, as you have told us, to Baron HARADA to take to Prince SAIONJI, did Baron HARADA read

it through himself?

Generally I think he read it through and where he found mistakes I think he made corrections. Now, on page 37,493 you were asked a question about Chapter 262, dated the 9th of February, and about the first entry in it. I want you to look again at Chapter 262, please. (Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.) Does that chapter begin with a date? I don't mean th date at the head of the chapter, but the first sentence 10 of it, doe it contain a date? 11 A At the beginning of the text I find the date 12 31 January. 13 (Whereupon the Fonitor spoke to 14 the Japanese Court Reporter.) 15 THE INTERPRETER (Resuming): At the beginning 16 of the sentence I find the date "31 January." My friend read it -- he was mislead by a mis-18 typing in the translation -- read it as 21 January, and 19 based upon that an argument that there was a long interval 20 between then and the 9th of February, the date which 21

the chapter bears. The correct date is 31 January.

261? Is the date at the head of that one 28 January?

It says January 21.

Now, would you look at the preceding chapter,

24

22

23

```
I was asking you at the moment about the date
  under the chapter number, Chapter 261; is the date there
  following "28 January?"
3
4
3
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
 19
 20
 21
 22.
 23
 24
 25
```

2

3

Ą

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunel please, this witness has testified orally that she used to go up there on occasions once every three weeks more or less, and she stated in her affidavit she used to go up there once a week or once or twice a week. The only reason I started to use these documents yesterday was to show that this record bore out the statement that she went up there once every three weeks on some occasions. I think it is a waste of time to go through these same documents.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a matter entirely within our discretion. 'Te won't allow time to be wasted.

Proceed, Mr. Carr.

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Mrs. KONOYE, as to Chapter 261, you have the neading there "Chapter 261," have you?

A It says the "261st," and to the right end and toward the edge the date "January 28."

Yes. Now, does that chapter begin also with a reference to a date?

The date at the beginning of the sentence is January 21.

THE MONITOR: Strike out "January"; just "23 . "

Now. I have only one further question.

5

7

S

9

• 10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

21

23

24

These memoirs are divided into chapters, as we have seen from these examples. Was each chapter dictated at one sitting or at more than one?

A Then the dictation was rather short, dictation for two occasions were combined to constitute one.

And when we find a long chapter was that dictated all at the same time or at more than one time?

A That I don't quite recall exactly.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is all I ask.

MR. BROOKS: On behalf of General MINAMI and General KOISO I wish to cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: It is too late. If he has brought out new matter affecting either of those two, you have the liberty to cross-examine to that extent.

MR. COMYNS CARR: In my submission, your Fonor, everything I put was strictly re-examination and there is no new matter in it.

THE PRESIDENT: "hat is the new matter, Captain Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: Would you like it by question?
I think the Court can judge very quickly from the first couple of questions.

THE PRESIDENT: It is easier to indicate the new matter.

MR. BROCK: That is what I mean, indicate it in the question, to save time. RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BROOKS: . 4 Did HARADA dictate by chapters? 5 Yes. A And at the time when he dictated by chapter was a heading given to that chapter? 8 MR. COMYNE CARR: I object to this, your 9 Honor. It is entirely new matter. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed, obviously. 11 MR. BROOK: Did I understand --12 THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed. 13 Were the headings placed at the chapters put 14 on there after this book was edited by PATOMI? 15 16 No, that wasn't the case. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr, you had better take 17 18 objection. This witness is answering. 19 MR. BROOKS: I didn't hear from Mr. Carr. 20 THE INTERPRETER: The witness replied, "That 21 wasn't the case." 22 THE PRESIDE T: That question is improperly 23 put, Captain Brooks. You are not entitled to put those 24 questions at this stage. 25

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Carr answered the question

he saying they were put in there by SCAP and were not in the original Japanese.

MR. COMYNS CARR: They are not in the Japanese at all, the headings my friend is speaking of, which are in the SCAP translation, and I shall not be using any part of them, so my friend need not trouble with them.

IM. BROOKS: I would like to ask if the transletors insertions were also put in there by SCAP, or is that by this witness?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Translators notes are of course put in by the translators.

MR. BROOKS: "The were the translators, if your Fenor please?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I don't know why I should be cross-examined.

THE PRESIDENT: To get a series of admissions,
I take it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, if my friend had been listening to my running commentary yesterday, he would know that all the entries we are about to put in have had the SCAP translation revised by our own translators, including, of course, the notes.

MR. BROOKS: You can see surely, this Tribunal, that the only way we can be satisfied of what is in

3 4 5

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23

there that is not hearsay or rumor or revision is to got the originals in here and give us a fair opportunity to check on these documents. "e can't even check translations.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Fonor --

MR. BROOKS: Just a minute; I haven't finished.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am objecting.

MR. BROOKS: "ait until I finish.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am objecting now.

MR. BROOKS: I haven't finished. I would like to finish, your Fonor.

THE PRESIDENT: We will have to adjourn if this disorderly procedure continues. Between you, you should have some regard for the Tribunal and not try to talk together. That is utterly disorderly. I have never known it to happen before and I have been over twenty years on the bench. If you have no regard for each other, you should have every regard for us.

Greenberg

6

7

8

9

10

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Henor, may I take an objection to the line of argument that is now being presented?

THE PRESTINT: If Mr. Brooks has completed what he has to say--

MR. BROOKS: I haven't.

THE PRESIDENT: --you may answer him. He says he has not completed what he has to say.

MR. BROOKS: I desire to submit the importance of having both of these documents, the originals, before us so that the Language Section -- we could refer them as to whether the translation produced by the prosecution is based on the one she is talking . about or the one that I am talking about, and whether the photostat, all of the photostats, are of the ones that she is talking about or of the ones that I am talking about, so that we can check them and also have something to gauge and to use to check what additions were made from the original that I am talking about. It would be very important to know what SAIONJI himself thought about some of HARADA's statements and it would show up by this fashion. We could see the correction and possibly get the trend as to why certain corrections were being made, if your Honers please.

I would even concede, if your Honors please,

& Yelde

19

18

21 22

23

KONOYE 37,522

that it is not necessary because of the large bulk to bring all of these documents in, but of both series of originals, the first volume and the second volume and one or two sample volumes in however, that we can use for comparison and have a fair opportunity to know where we stand. I cannot properly crossexamine this witness, as I requested the other day, until I have documents like that upon which I can base proper questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr.

MR. BROOKS: I would like to ask for three, if your Honor please, of each; the first, last and one somewhere in the middle. For instance--

THE PRESIDENT: This is one of the most important documents ever presented to a court, and if there is any question about it, and there are serious questions, they should be fully investigated.

MR. BROOKS: My Japanese counsel assures me that it is vitally important and they can read Japanese. I am just going on their word, your Honor. That is why I am fighting up here now.

THE PRESIDENT: I take it your application is due wholly to the fact that a witness has been called, and even if you had the documents before, you would need them now to cross-examine her effectively.

KONOYE

MR. BROOKS: That's right, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You asked for these documents yesterday, Captain Brooks--

MR. BROOKS: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: --when your right to crossexamine still existed. Rightly or wrongly, I announce the decision of the Court that you should not have them for the time being.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor pleases, I think this is the fourth time that my friend has asked for the production of original diaries and on each of the previous occasions he has been overruled on the ground that to look at the original of that which has been photostated couldn't help anybody because the photostat exactly reproduces the original. In my submission that reasoning still holds good. If my friend is now asking for the production of some other document other than the original from which these photostats were taken, I have no information as to what exactly he wants nor whether it is obtainable. The photostats are taken from the original document as handed to SCAP, and the translations are made from the photostats. The prosecution will, of course, endeavor to do anything which the Court directs, but

1

11

9

10

2

3

4

5

6

12

14

16

18

20

21

23

24

KONOYE 37,524

in our submission if there is any other document in existence other than the one which we have photostated, the defense are in as good a position to obtain it as we are.

THE PRESIDENT: But if they do get it, this witness in the box is the one person above all others who can explain it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor, she is.

It is only now for the first time that my friend has suggested that there is some other document which he wants to compare. In my submission it is still correct to say that merely to produce the original of that which has been photostated would be of no value whatever. Equally, it would be of no value to produce if it is available—I don't know if it is—the much later version containing some grammatical alterations by Mr. SATOMI. If my friend will explain what it is that he really wants and the Court thinks it will be of assistance for us to produce it, we will endeavor to try to trace it.

MR. BROOKS: I may do it on the recess unless the Court wants it on the record. I think it is already on the record. I would like to have part one, part twe, volumes one and two in both the original from which the photostat was taken and the corrected copy that I

1 2 3

have talked about or the original copy. Now, Mr. Carr seems to think there are three originals. I only thought there were two. He is talking about another one.

THE PRESIDENT: Discuss it during the recess. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Whalen & Whalen

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, have you straightened out your differences? If you haven't I was going to suggest that you apply to me in Chambers, Captain Brooks, for any additional documents you require in this matter.

MR. BROOKS: I have an announcement as to the documents I think would be of importance, if the Court would care to hear me.

The point that I wish to make is that am interested in volume 1 of part 1, and volume 1 and 2 of part 2 particularly as they are marked on the English translation of the Civil Intelligence Section.

Now, to make it clearer, if your Honors please, I ask that of these volumes referred to we have the original volume which I will call "A" and that we also produce the original volume "B" which is the revised volume, and also the original volume "C", which was SATOMI's revision on that, so that we can compare them with "D", which is the photostat as I understand of "B", and that these may also be compared with the English copy which we might call volume "E". Then the witness may be properly cross-examined as to the differences between the original "A" and the "B" from which the

KONOYE 37,527

photostatic copy "D" was made. If a small diagram is made of these five volumes the Court, by placing those numbers, can see the relative importance of cross-examination on those and the importance to the defense of knowing that changes were made in the original "A" that were mode by SAIONJI in "B" and whether volume "D", the photostat, is a complete photostat of the revised original "B" entirely or a combination of some other group.

My statement is, then, that the eriginal volume "A", unrevised, is the best evidence and should be placed before this Tribunal and it will be then for this Tribunal to judge whether the revisions made in volume "B" by SAIO JI or others after that were justified or not.

on the back of the first document on the prosecution's list, IPS document 3150 378-B, there is a statement as to the custody of part of these original volumes,
or as the prosecution interprets that was the intention.

Whether it was carried out neither the prosecution or
myself are aware at this time. However, I understand
that the original volume "A" and the original volume
"B" as revised are in Japan either in the hands of
the Emperor or of the HARADA family unless they have
been taken by allied sections of some nature that we

don't know anything about

I desire volumes "A" "B" and "C", as I have referred to, of these originals, three originals, to use to cross-examine this witness and for other purposes before the Tribunal. The prosecution seems to understand what I want and we have it on the record, if your Honors please.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

Mi. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal. For the first time my learned friend has stated that he wants something other than merely the original of that which we have photostated, and if the Tribunal thinks that any part of what he is asking for will be of assistance we will, of course, make our best endeavors to get it here.

In the first place let us make it quite clear, and I think we are in agreement about this as to what it is we have already got. We have got a photostatic copy of what my friend calls "B". That is to say, the fair copy which was made by this witness after Prince SAIONJI had made his corrections on the original draft and incorporating those corrections. No doubt the original of that document "B" is still in existence, and if the Tribunal thinks it would be of any assistance we will endeavor to procure the three volumes that my friend has asked for of that original "B". In my submission, however, for reasons stated and accepted by the Tribunal on several of the previous occasions when he has asked for that, it couldn't help anybody because the photostat is the same thing.

Now, whether what my friend calls "A", namely Baron HARADA's first drafts written by this witness.

XONOYE 37,530

from his dictation and annotated or corrected by Prince SAIONJI, is still in existence or not, whether it was, as the document which I am going to tender in a moment and from which my friend has quoted, intended to be deposited with the Emperor or not I do not know. If the Tribunal so directs we will, of course, endeavor to find and bring here the three parts of that to which my friend has referred and for which he has asked.

As to what he calls "C", namely the subsequent attempt by SATOMI to bring it into book form by putting it in literary language, that, in my submission, is entirely irrelevant, and we would ask the Tribunal tot to di ect us to endeavor to find that.

Your Honor, might I just offer this suggestion, that it might be of assistance to the Tribunal in determining this question if I were to put in and read in full the excerpt to which my friend has referred in which HAKADA, himself, describes the original and intended custody of the memoirs?

THE PRESIDENT: The majority of the Tribunal refuses Captain Brooks' application, except as to document "A". That may shorten the matter.

MR. COMYR3 CARR: If your Honor pleases, then we will immediately make endeavors to trace document "A" and to bring here those parts of it for which

Captain Brooks has asked.

Mk. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I appreciate that very much, and if, while the prosecution is making this investigation, if they would tell us, or find while they are inquiring where volume "B" is located so that we can use it for comparison, then we would be certain that "A" was actually being brought in and not "B" under the guise of "A". I am not accusing anyone of that but it is possible on a technical matter that a mistake could be made. So I will ask for both of them.

(Whereupon, the above statement was read back by the official court reporter at the request of the Monitor.)

THE MONITOR: Mr. Brooks, do you have a cor-

Mi. BROOKS: The correction was "So that is why I asked for them." I am not asking for them now because that would be in defiance of the Court's ruling. I say that is why I asked for them, to prevent that.

Duda & Spratt

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I have no objection to giving my friend that information, if I can get it, but I suspect the defense know better than we do.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I want to make this remark. If I know where this document was I would have part of it here or I would have it here to tell the Tribunal about it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you had better proceed without regard to the observation.

the witness be released on the usual terms, which includes, of course, that she can be brought back for further cross-examination, if on the production of further documents it appears necessary.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I want to ask a few questions based on the prosecution's redirect examination.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I object to it.

THE PRESIDENT: We do not wish to hear any

further examination of this witness at this stage.

The defense position will be protected. She can be recalled for further cross-examination, if necessary.

MR. LOGAN: Under the rules which we have

20

21

23

24

KONOYE 37,533

been following, if the Tribunal please, I have a right to ask this witness serveral questions just the same as Mr. Brooks asked several questions, and I was the one who conducted the cross-examination, and I intend to ask her with respect to several new statements that appeared during the redirect examination.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this is entirely irregular. In my submission there is no such procedure as my friend has referred to. I introduced nothing in re-examination which did not arise directly out of the cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the view of the

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, there are two points. One is the statement by Mr. Carr that this witness saw all the volumes. That is something new. And the second point is this: that in my practice where a witness leaves the stand and comes back the next morning and changes her story, we have a right to examine her and find out why it was changed.

THE PRESIDENT: She made a statement the purport of which was not clear to some Members of the Tribunal. She was re-examined to clear it up. That

d

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

21

23

25

does not mean that new matter has been introduced.

The Tribunal refuses your application to further cross-examine the witness at this stage, ir. Logan.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I propose to proceed with the presentation of the excerpts, having made clear that they are taken from the volume called "B," out of a series of volumes called "B," and that the translation is not the oraginal "CAP translation as it stood but has been revised by us owing to objections taken by the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: You do not require the witness any further?

MR. COMYNS CARE No, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: She is excused on the usual terms, or until she may be recalled for further cross-examination.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. McMANUS: If the Court pleases.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: Your Honor, just before the witness is excused: Mr. Comyns Carr stated that he had some documents that he intended to tender later. I think we are all well aware of what document or

documents it or they might be. However, if he intends to do that, rather than to take up the time of the Court possibly the witness, maybe, might remain in the witness box and the documents might be tendered through her so that then she might be cross-examined or questioned about such documents which are intended to be tendered.

THE PRESIDENT: You are about to refer to a statement by HARADA?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am about to tender excerpts from the diary itself, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that prefatory statement by HARADA part of what you are going to tender?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, it is in the diary itself.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we intend, of course, to object to various excerpts offered, but we have a general objection to the entire memoirs. May we offer that at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: I think this is the time to take a general objection, yes.

Is there to be a simultaneous translation?
MR. LOGAN: Yes.

This is our submission in connection with these memoirs -- it is not a diary.

That there is a cloud on the reliability

2

6

8

10

11

12

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

of the information contained in the various reports, rumors, hearsay and gossip in the so-called HARADA Memoirs is perhaps best demonstrated by the testimony on direct and cross-examination of the witnesses MURAYAMA, Tomiji and KONOYE, Yasuko. Before presenting Dr. MURAYAMA the prosecution made a statement on pages 37,441 through 37,444 of the record which fails to point out where any of the accused or any witnesses attacked the mentality of HARADA. There can be no inference from this statement by the prosecution that such a deduction might be drawn. As stated by the prosecution the attack was on the reliability of the document, It must therefore be apparent that the prosecution itself recognized that the HARADA Memoirs needed bolstering by a doctor's affidavit as to HARADA's memory and mentality. This we submit is an unheard of precedent where the prosecution itself created the issue of HARADA's memory and mentality. I need not recite Dr. MURAYAMA's testimony of yesterday as I am sure it is fresh in the minds of the Tribunal and it detracted rather than contributed to the reliability of HARADA's Memoirs.

with regard to the testimony of Mrs. KONOYE, the probative value of HARADA's Memoirs is perhaps

2 3 4

7 8

9

11

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

21 22

23

24

7 8

best demonstrated, in addition to her admission that she had difficulty in transcribing her notes in trying to discover what portion in a given sentence was the subject, by only referring to the following question which was addressed to Mrs. KONOYE and her answer, appearing on page 37,486 of the record:

"Q And the way you wrote the entries, isn't it true, Mrs. KONOYE, that it would be difficult for one to determine whether Baron HARADA was referring to present tense or past tense and it was difficult to determine the predicate and the subject of the sentences, and it was also difficult to tell who was saying what?

"A There were many portions which were as you have indicated."

The substance of her testimony is that the HARADA Memoirs are the composite result of sketchy notes written by HARADA in small pocket notebooks setting forth names of people and subject matter of the conversations -- dictation by HARADA from some of these notes but mostly from memory after a lapse of a considerable period of time -- a transcription of the notes in which Mrs. KONOYE did the best she could and wrote it the way she thought it should be written - and editing of the transcription by Prince SAIONJI

who as shown in the Memoirs was not present at the conversations HARADA had with other people, and in view of what happened this morning there is a question as to this, but it might be a revision of the document by a writer employed by HARADA to make it grammatically correct -- to decide what tense Baron HARADA was referring to and who was speaking in the various conversations (record page 37,485) and emphasizing rhetoric at the expense of facts. Besides the words being presented to this Tribunal for consideration being third or fourth-band, the memoirs are entirely predicated upon hearsay, prejudice, gossip, opinion, speculation, rumors, and donjecture, and if unreliable at its source it emerges in its present form before this Tribunal as Highly unworthy of consideration at all. This especially is true when one weighs the heavy implications of its words against the life and liberty of these accused who sit before you.

3

1

5

7

9

11

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

Further, Mrs. KONOYE stated on direct examination that at times HARADA appeared distracted; that he was thinking of something else; that there were occasions when he became sleepy while he was dictating to her or talking to someone else. In addition, we submit that before any conversations which HARADA had with any other person are admitted in evidence in this case, the prosecution should produce evidence that Prince SAIONJI did not edit those particular conversations.

shortly after the war. With all the translators and interpreters that the combined resources of eleven nations could hire it is a poor excuse that the contents of this diary could not have been presented on the prosecution case. And we call on the prosecution to explain why they withheld the introduction of the 105 excerpts which they propose to introduce from this diary. The prosecution cannot claim that they were not ready, because through ut this trial they have insisted that they were ready to proceed.

We submit that the original small pocket notebooks which HARADA kept are more important and of more probative value and assistance to this Tribunal than the unexplained and unexplainable editing by Prince SAIONJI. These pocket notebooks are the best evidence. They are the original evidence. Before accepting any documents offered we respectfully submit that the Tribunal should call on the prosecution to produce these original notebooks and offer them in evidence. Certainly human experience dictates the impossibility of the accuracy of reporting in quotation marks conversations which occurred on important subjects three weeks more or less after the conversations were had, particularly when many conversations were held during that period of tim.

In addition, many instances are found where HARADA, who was not in the cabinet, Privy Council, nor in the military, is reporting second- and third-nand hearsay of what took place at meetings of these bodies. Certainly none of this can have any importance at this stage of the trial. Many witnesses as well as some of the accused who were confronted with statements which appear in HARADA's diary have denied the accuracy of those statements. Some have commented on the strong language employed by HARADA. The prosecution has not produced one single witness so far, and we ask that this be done, who will verify the accuracy of the information contained in these memoirs and as set forth by HARADA.

At this stage of the proceeding, such evidence as HARADA's diary has no importance -- importance
now, to me, legally, can only be interpreted as meaning original evidence, not unreliable second- or thirdhand evidence as it set forth in these memoirs. The
prosecution has listed excerpts which were never presented to any witness or accused against whom they are
presumably offered. We submit that the Tribunal
should not be a party to any attempt on the part of
the prosecution to deprive the accused of a fair trial
by the introduction of such hearsay, third-hand information of a "peddler of information," as one of the
accused characterized HARADA. That statement has not
been contradicted by the prosecution as yet and it was
brought out by the prosecution in cross-examination.

As pointed out by the resourceful prosecution on page 37,442 of the record, the translation of the HARADA diary as transcribed by Mrs. KONOYE, edited by Prince SAIONJI and perhaps revised by SATOMI, prepared by the Civil Intelligence Section of SCAP, has been scrapped and the prosecution has prepared its own translation, record page 37,442 and two statements by the prosecution this morning. Mrs. KONOYE, herself, admitting the difficulties involved in comprehending the Japanese as used by HARADA, had to speculate --

which means pure guessing -- as to his meaning on many occasions, as she testified. Attention is called to her testimony appearing on page 37,487 of the record:

"A When I was transcribing my notes, I had great difficulty in trying to discover just what portion in a given sentence was the subject.

"Q And I suppose you aid the best you could and wrote it out the way you thought it should be, is that right?

"A Naturally, yes."

Is this not a forecast of the complete unreliability and unworthiness of such evidence, clearly revealing to the Tribunal that it should be rejected in its entirety in considering the fateful issues before it for judgment. If a Japanese could not understand t, I do not see how any translator could.

The prosecution has stated its purpose in offering these choice excerpts as being for the purpose of contradicting witnesses who "have made statements under cross-examination or in their direct evidence which are in whole or in part contrary to entries in those volumes," page 37,442 of the record. These vigorously-disputed excerpts can have no importance or probative value for such a purpose. In addition, the Tribunal has intimated, although the prosecution has

6

1

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

22

24

failed to concur, that we are now engaged in a reopening of the prosecution's case. If that be true, then these documents have no place in such a phase. The usual ground for the reopening of a case is founded upon a discovery of new evidence which with reasonable diligence could not have been discovered during the presentation of the prosecution case. Whether we accept the Tribunal's interpretation that this is a reopening of the prosecution's case, or if we accept the prosecution's interpretation that this is rebuttal evidence, it is not acceptable in either case because it is neither new evidence nor effective in impugning the credibility of any witness. This is no such evidence, and with men's lives at stake it is respectfully submitted that such flimsy and unreliable evidence be rejected in toto.

In view of the prosecution's statement on page 37,442 of the record, it would be a farce for tr Tribunal to accept any of this evidence for the purpose of impeachment, which is the expressed purpose declared by the prosecution. The prosecution stated at that page: "For this reason we have had the translation of all the excerpts which we are using revised and in every case the excerpt which will be tendered now is in revised translation."

24

1.

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Thus, upon its own admission the excerpts offered are different from those presented to any witness. I made strenuous objection, record pages 31,436 to 31,440, to the prosecution's reading the English from SCAP's translation and having our court interpreters translate that English to the witness into Japanese, and I suggested at that time that the Japanese from the original documents should be read by the translators. This method was not followed. So the result is that the prosecution is now offering, on its onw statement, a different version than that which was submitted to any of the witnesses.

In the deep pit that has been dug into the recognized Anglo-American rules of adjective law by the admission of various types of questionable evidence, there must be established a minimum limitation. While the substantive rulings will occupy the paramount position of importance, this Tribunal must also recognize that the rules by which the evidence itself is admitted will incur the critical eye of future scholars and critics of international jurisprudence.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half-

past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was

taken.)

N

f 80 L

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at

1330.

2

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think any Member of the Tribunal wishes to hear you, Mr. Carr. Certain. points raised by Mr. Logan can be elucidated when particular documents are being tendered.

MR. COM'NS CARR: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan's general objection is overruled.

MR. COMYNS CARR: There were two or three errors of fact in my friend's statement which I would rather like the opportunity of correcting, if I might be permitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it will only lead to further discussion perhaps.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor.

Then, for the purposes of the record, I understand from your clerk that the procedure I adopted yesterday of asking for on identification number for the wrole of the diery is inconvenient in view of the fact that the whole of it is not in court. I would

20 21

22

ask the Tribunal to cancel that marking and to have each volume from which I shall be presenting quotations separately marked for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: That course will be followed.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor please.

Then I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-378-B, which is one of the last entries, for the purpose of explaining exactly the manner in which these records were compiled and the custody to which they were entrusted in October, 1940. This makes it clear in our submission that these records while not absolutely made from day to day were made at very short intervals and corrected by Frince SAIONJI. The pages shown on all these excerpts are those in the SCAP translation, which will enable anybody to look at the context.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: May I inquire from the prosecution what these diagonal marks mean? This particular document seems rather overloaded with them.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The words between the diagonal marks, or sometimes they are printed as bracket marks, are not in the manuscript but are translators' notes. There are one or two cases where

-

_

such markings have been put in copies in error to which I shall call attention.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, the defense objects to the admission of this document because it is, I should say, at least half of translators' notes. There are so many and so long that it is very difficult to tell what is the text and what is Baron HARADA's so-called record and what is the translator testifying.

THE PRESIDENT: We will have no difficulty in distinguishing.

MR. FURNESS: Well, we object to it upon that ground because it has no probative value and if it is admitted, we will ask that it be referred to the Language Section to check just what is said here.

Its only importance is that it apparently shows that the prosecution knows or should know where the original is.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my view most of the translators' notes are unrecessary and meraly make plain what is obvious without them.

"Chapter 378

"(20 October 1940) pages 2974-7."

I omit the title which is not part of the

document.

1 2

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, in reading this manuscript we would like to ask that the translators' notes be not read.

THE PRESIDENT: Read the document.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Correction as to exhibit No. 3751, marked yesterday for identification. This exhibit number applies only to prosecution No. 3150-378, being the photostatic copy of the original SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs. And the excerpt therefrom, just admitted, bearing the number 3150-378-B, will receive exhibit No. 3751-A.

(Whereupon, prosecution document No. 3150-378-B was marked exhibit No. 3751-A and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: The transcript of the document must show the diagonal strokes.

MR. BROOKS: The number just announced, and the title given to this as described by the Clerk, might be misleading if your Honors recall our contention previously as to what is meant by the original document. I just want that to show on the record. I think that it is enough just to call it to the Court's attention.

THE PRESIDENT: The IPS number and the exhibit number are both different from the earlier document.

CLERK OF THE COURT: No, sir, the first number, 3150, applied to the entire memoirs and the number 378 only applies to a chapter.

THE PRESIDENT: The IPS dash number of this particular document is 3150-378-B. It has not been given before. The exhibit number is 3751-A and that has not been given before.

Read the document, Mr. Carr, please.

MR. COMYNS CARH: (Heading)

"On that same day, I went to Okitsu and reported /to Prince SAIONJI/ on the latest happenings since I last saw him. I consulted the Prince about requesting Prince TAKAMATSU to keep the transcriptions/ manuscript of the SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs/ in the care of his Highness until they were delivered into the hands of the Emperor. Prince SAIONJI agreed to this 18 and said: 'If his Highness /Prince TAKAMATSU/ doesn't mind, I believe that would be a very splendid arrange-20 21 22 ment. 23

"On the 19th, I returned to my home in Oiso. On the morning of the 20th, because /I learned that/ His Highness /Prince TAKAMATSU, a Navy officer/ had

3

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

returned to his palece from his ship, I called him on the telephone and talked with His Highness personally over the phone. His Highness said: 'Come at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon.' I went to the Takanawa Palace /of Prince TAKAMATSU at the appointed time/ I told His Highness: 'This record /manuscript of the SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs/ was started in 1929. The following is the reason why this was undertaken: At the time of the London Treaty /when it was a major political issue/ only false rumors about the issue prevailed; and the truth about the matter was never known /to the public/. Especially, the attitude taken by the Emperor has been, for the most part, falsely rumored. However, the counsel given to the Throne and actions taken by the Genro /Prince SAIONJI/, court officials close to the Emperor, and the Cabinet Winisters on the whole, have been falsely rumored. 17 As a direct result, this created serious perturbations in the political circles; and this was the direct . cause of subsequent disturbances in the Army and Navy. The virtues and intelligent perspicacity of the Emperor 21 were perverted almost beyond imagination by propaganda. I felt that this was on exceedingly regrettable fact. Since I /HARADA/ knew, in my capacity /as Prince SAIONJI's secretary/ the truth of the matter, I felt

1

11 12

13

18

22

23

that there was a necessity for recording this in written form for posterity. Therefore, I consulted KONOYE, we decided to seek the assistance of /Viscountess KONOYE, Yasuko/ the wife of /Viscount KONOYE/ Hidemaro, the younger brother of Prince KONOYE, and have her take it down /as I dictate it/ and thus preserve it for posterity. It has now grown to 10,000 odd pages.

being made. Every week, I go to see Prince SAIONJI and make a report to him; my memorandum for this report is used as the basic material and I have it taken down and hept. I then take the transcribed manuscript of the notes to SAIONJI; he reads the material personally, corrects mistakes, and adds whatever additional notes he deems necessary to the manuscript. He returns it to me the next time I go to see him. A clean copy of this is made; this is then edited and filed away.

Memoirs is being compiled/ has occasionally appeared in the newspapers; moreover, even the fact that this /manuscript of the SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs/ is deposited for protective custody in the Sumitomo Trust Company has become known to the public. I have heard there is danger that a faction of the rightists might, under certain circumstances, destroy it /manuscript of the SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs/. Therefore, I have consulted Prince SAIONJI about this matter and have decided to request Your Highness to keep it in Your Highness' personal custody until it is completed. When it is completed, the original manuscript which has Prince SAIONJI's corrections and revisions on it will be presented to the Emperor in its original form. The edited copy will be

printed and published at a suitable occasion. I think it won't be possible, in all probability, to publish the document until after 10 or 15 years have elapsed from the death of Prince SAIONJI. At any rate, the future custody of it is entrusted to MATSUDATRA, the Chief Secretary to the Lord Privy Seal. I would like to have Your Highness consult (ATSUDATRA and make thorough arrangements so that he will be able to keep in close touch with Your Highness' steward /for preserving the manuscript in Your Highness' custody/.'

"His Highness /Prince TAKAMATSU/ said: 'I's gladly give consent. I shall give thorough instruction about the matter to YAMANOUCHI, the steward, to make suitable arrangements (in regards to the manuscript) with him.' I thanked His Highness for this and changed the topic of our discussion."

I now offer in evidence IPS document No.

3150-2-A in rebuttal of (1) ARAKI's denial that he and
HARADA were very close friends or acquaintances, page
28,331, first answer, (2) his statement that the
Kokuhonsha had no political significance or meaning wha
soever, page 28,332, fourth answer, and (3) his refusa
to admit that he was an idolizer of HIRANUMA, page
28,332, third answer.

MR. McMANUS: If the Court pleases, I believe

7 8

the Court will recall that when Mr. Carr suggested that he might attempt to offer this HARADA Diary into evidence, I objected.

THE PRESIDENT: On behalf of ARAKI for whom you now appear.

monished me for making such an objection in anticipation of what might happen. Now that a concrete document is being offered, I object to it. I should like to state my reasons, but before doing so, I should like to also remind the Court that I objected to this HARADA-SAIONJI Diary in toto because it contained opinions, conclusions thoughts, operations of the mind of someone, and after, particularly, the cross-examination that has happened here in the past day or so, that was the basis originally for my objection to the entire document as a whole

However, I shall deal with each individual document as they are presented.

Concerning this particular document, might I invite the Tribunal's attention to the dashes before the beginning on line 1? Might I also invite the Tribunal' attention to: a newspaper man once told me or "I heard from him"? Need I invite the attention of the Tribunal to anything such as that?

THE PRESIDENT: No. It is the next two

sentences that matters.

objecting to the entire document. I call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that HARADA says, "from a certain point of view," and then he says, "I think." Well, the entire thing is incomplete. There is nothing there except what the prosecutor wants to put in. It is not even an opinion. It is not even a conclusion. The man thinks. It is an operation of the man's mind and at that a dead man's mind, not a living man's mind.

The contents of the document, if the Tribunal pleases, are purely conjectural on the part of anyone who might have written it, and if it suits the prosecution's purpose to put it in, where is the original? How do we know this happened?

I further object on the ground that it is an excerpt and, as I have stated on many occasions before, anyone could make, if the Tribunal pleases, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address look like a ransom note if you put the excerpts all together. I object to the document.

THE PRESIDENT: The defense has tendered many excerpts, rightly so. Do not indulge in generalities if you can avoid it, Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: Well, I object to this document, if the Tribunal pleases, on the ground that it is

E.

incomplete and that it calls for an operation of a man's mind, and --THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have made that. MR. McMANUS: Yes. I object to the document, Mr. President. THE PRESIDENT: Has this excerpt been revised since ARAKI was shown it?

K a 1 p 1 2 e a 3 u

&

Kn

ap

p

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MR. COMYNE CARR: No, your Honor. He wasn't shown it, your Honor, but it hasn't been revised since questions were based upon it.

With regard to its being shown, your Honor, immediately before introducing this excerpt I offered to produce, either to the Court or to the defense, the whole of the excerpts that I was going to use, as I used them. The Tribunal ruled that they would not see them until they were tendered in evidence in rebuttal, and the defense did not ask to see them.

MR. McMANUS: If the Tribunal pleases, I should have been only too happy to see any documents containing such excerpts as these. Furthermore, I should also think that maybe the Court might like to see the original, also.

May I ask the Tribunal to distinguish the difference between something such as this and a newspaper article?

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I represent HIRANUMA and I haven't had a chance to say a word, and the objection is overruled before I have had an opportunity to say a word.

THE PRESIDENT: You don't treat the Court with

(8.5)

18

19

20

22

23

24

proper respect. You sit at the table, there is a pause, there is no appearance of anybody coming to object, a decision is given, and then you say you weren't heard. That is not right.

MR. WARREN: I must respectfully disagree with the Tribunal. I came up here, had this in my hand, and the President of the Tribunal asked a question, and this lectern is pretty crowded; the prosecutor never sits down while we are up here. So I went back and sat down like a gentleman. And I do want to make an objection.

THE PRESIDENT: The document is admitted against ARAKI in any event. We have heard him. We will hear you now, on HIRANUMA.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, sir. What I should like to say about this document --

THE PRESIDENT: I am reminded that you prompted Mr. McManus.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I probably did. I said
"Stick by your guns, Mr. McManus; don't let the
prosecutor push you away from the lectern any further."

MR. McMANUS: If the Court pleases, I didn't need any prompting.

THE PRESIDENT: So you came to the lectern in the first place to prompt him and not to make an

objection.

Proceed with the objection.

MR. WARREN: This is nothing but an opinion where it concerns HIRANUMA. It is based upon something not before the Tribunal. We don't know what it is, but it looks like HARADA didn't like HIRANUMA. He states he was intimate with ARAKI but that in effect ARAKI was an idolizer of HIRANUMA and therefore ARAKI was an unfit person to sit close to the Throne.

So, it amounts to nothing but opinion evidence of the character of HIRANUMA, and I submit to this Tribunal that I have brought before this Tribunal in the HIRANUMA case an affidavit of two men whose word could hardly be questioned, even by this Tribunal. That was General Pigett and ex-Ambassador Grew. And I say if the Tribunal accepts this document, they are accepting character testimony as to the bad character of HIRANUMA by a man who apparently didn't like him, and rejected the best character evidence that this Tribunal could possibly get.

MR. LOGAN: In view of the fact that this is a conspiracy charge, if the Tribunal please, I assume I have a right to object on behalf of KIDO.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Mr. Logan, we would like you to cooperate with the Tribunal to the full extent,

that is, to avoid a number of counsel taking objections.

MR. LOGAN: We are trying to do that, if the Tribunal please. I just wanted to make this general observation, that when we endeavored to obtain character evidence, I recall one examination when the German Ambassador was on the stand here; we asked him questions as to the character of one of the accused and we were restricted to conversations that he may have had with the accused. Now, if this document is admitted, it is going contrary to that decision.

I also wish to point out that if this is rebutta evidence, there is nothing that has been presented by my friend here that this document was ever shown to any witness or accused, and if it is new evidence, on a reopened case, there is no grounds stated why it should be admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No. No. 3150-2 will receive exhibit No. 3754 for identification only, and the excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document No. 3150-2A, will receive exhibit No. 3754-A.

(Whereupon, prosecution document No.

3150-2 was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3754 for identification; prosecution document

3 4

1

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

17

18

20

21

22

24

No. 3150-2A was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3754-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR (reading): "... On the night of the 13th, a newspaperman came to my place and I heard from him that the commander of the Sixth Division, Lt. Gen. Sadao ARAKI, was to be the Chief Aide-de-Camp to the Emperor. I was very intimate with Lt. Gen. ARAKI but he was an idolizer of Baron HIRANUMA and a prominent figure in the so-called KOKUHONSHA. Therefore, to have such a person serving so close to the Emperor is a serious matter from a certain point of view and I think it very dangerous.

I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-2B, to rebut KOISO's testimony that the purpose of the Kokuhonsha Society was to support a proper and true understanding of the nature and spirit of Japan and its members, and to prove that this society was an instrument used by HIRANUMA for personal political purposes. The reference is transcript pages 32,274-75.

. 12

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: On behalf of the accused KOISO

I wish to object to this document as having no probative value and being unimportant. I wish to object further that it is not the best evidence, as it is not a translation from the original before it was offered. This is apparent from a previous exhibit, 3751-A, on the back page thereof.

Paragraph 1 of the prosecution's own exhibit reads that the manuscript was taken of notes to SAIONJI. He read the material personally, corrected mistakes, and added whatever additional notes he deemed necessary to the manuscript. "He returns it to me the next time I go to see him. Then a clean copy of this is made. This is then edited again and filed away."

THE PRESIDENT: We have already decided that. Thy bring it up again?

MR. BROOKS: This latter clean copy with the edited notes is what the Tribunal has before it, which is third-hand, and I say is not the best evidence. The prosecution has not made an attempt to bring in the original unaltered notes of HARADA, who had personal knowledge in some instances. That is why I had suggested to the prosecution that they steer away from this evidence for the time being, since they

4 5

have several other lists of documents not involving these memoirs, and allow us to give them a little time to produce the originals and save ultimately an enormous amount of time before this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: All that has been taken into account.

MR. BROOKS: Yes. If the original is produced, your Fonors of course will realize, and a hundred and some odd of these documents are admitted, even over objection, and that original does what I think it will do, it will have been a horrible waste of time.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, here is another document that the prosecution is attempting to bring in that they should have brought in in their case in chief.

THE PRESIDENT: "ell, that no longer matters, Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: Not to your Honor, but to me it does.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, no, you are not going to get away with that. A decision of this Court allows such material to be given.

MR. WARREN: In any event, not one word was

5

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

21

22

23 24

said in their case in chief on KOKUHONSHA or the remarks made by counsel with reference to HIRANIMA.

Now they are coming in and attempting to impeach another witness, to bring in testimony that ordinarily they could never bring in, and they are doing it by innuendo.

Now, the only place that they mentioned that was on cross-examination of another witness. At that time we had a right to expect that if this evidence was introduced at this time it would be rebuttal evidence and we would have met it in our case in chief, and I charge the prosecution with knowing that we would have done it at the time. But we were denied that right.

THE PRESIDENT: You may not intend it, Colonel Warren, but you are really debating a decision already given. The test is: Fas it probative value? Is it important? I made that plain two or three days ago.

MR. WARREN: "ell, your Fonor, may I do this, then? May I request that the prosecution be required to get up here and introduce this on its probative value and not as rebuttal evidence? That is what they have done every time, and sr we have to meet it, fire with fire. We will accept that ruling, but the prosecution refuses to do it and still bring it in in an attempt to try my client on what they characterize as rebuttal evidence.

2 3 4

But I won't pursue that any further. wish to point out that the very dictum from this socalled extract itself shows that HARADA, or whoever wrote it -- and I don't know who wrote it -- but that HARADA himself only thought things about HIRANUMA, because he goes ahead, and after the mechanisms of his own mind, which you can naturally follow through, says "even the army thinks ... " How in the world can he know what the army thinks unless he talked with every man in the army? It is ridiculous.

Then he makes a reflection in here to the effect -- you might think he got it from this -- about an army list in secret that he looked at. Well, we tere required to produce the documents that we referred to in our evidence, but where is this army list in secret? I submit, if everything in here is considered as having been the truth, it is of no importance. But we will be required to answer it with evidence, because if the Tribunal takes it we have to assume it thinks it is important -- we will be required to answer it, first with evidence and then later on we are going to have to comment on it in our summation, and it is going to take a lot of time, and we don't want to have to take that time to meet it unless it is necessary.

MR. McMANUS: If the Tribunal pleases, I would

24

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

like to renew my objection, or offer an objection to this particular document, on the general grounds that I have objected to the entire Baron HARADA and SAIONJI Diary. However, as far as this particular document is concerned, it is also incomplete. Who is Colonel INOUE? And after a secret glance at an army list, as stated in the first sentence, how can the writer make any deductions? This is strictly a supposition, a conclusion, and a conjecture by the writer.

I object to the document.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-2B will receive exhibit No. 3754-B.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3754-B and received in evidence.) MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"16 July 1931.

"Thereupon, I went to the War Linistry and Met Col. INOUE, and looked at the Army List in secret. As it is today, even the Army thinks that Lt. Gen. ARAKI is a follower of HIRANUMA. The Army says that Lt. General Senjuro HAYASHI, Commander of the Chosen Army, is the most suitable man for the position. If not he, then Lt. Gen. KAWASHIMA, the Commander of the division at Nagoya. At the present time, there are no others. After my return home I went so far as to call the Imperial Household minister on the phone and told him about this.

"By these indications, even in the matter of disarmament, it is clear that the extreme rightist KOKUHONSHA is maneuvering in concert with the Army. That these problems arise, both directly and indirectly

21

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

is, I think, a very disconcerting matter."

I now offer in evidence IPS document No. 3157-8A, relating to August 23, 1931 and a conversation between MINAMI and Railway Minister LGI, which mINAMI, at page 19,825-6, said he did not remember at all.

please, to this document on the same grounds as I had to the other objection and to an additional ground that in the contents of the document itself, this is secondary evidence. There is no showing, as we have been required to do for a witness' name, as to whether EGI is dead or not. I think that if the Railway minister EGI is alive he should be brought before the Court so that we have the right to crossexamine.

THE PRESIDENT: So far we have not prevented the defense from calling him.

MR. BROOKS: I think that the burden should be on the prosecution first to show that the man whom they are talking about is either dead or not obtainable to bring before this Tribunal and have the witness before they should be allowed to bring in secondary evidence. I state that this is an additional objection, and in my submission the document should

)

not be received until the usual rules are complied with. Furthermore, this document was not shown to MINAMI, as I have been able to ascertain, and I would like, if it is admitted, to reserve the right to produce EGI in rebuttal and to recall MINAMI to the stand if I deem it necessary.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document advitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
No. 3150-8 will receive exhibit No. 3755 for identification only; and the excerpt therefrom, being
prosecution document 3150-8A, will receive exhibit
No. 3755-A.

(Whereupon, document 3150-8 was marked prosecution exhibit 3755 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, 3155-8A, was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3755-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"August 23, 1931.

"/KONOYE SPEAKING/ Later, the Chief of the Asia Bureau said: 'The Army is attempting to use the killing of Captain NAKAMURA in mongolia as a tool for the solution of the Manchuria-Mongolian matter by

3 4

6

8

9

.10

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

enlarging the importance of the incident. It is very troublesome.

Railway minister EGI and mentioned these things to him. He /EGI/ said: 'I did not know anything about it but War minister MINAMI came to Hakone yesterday and told me all about it. At that time, I /EGI/ asked him: "The discipline of the Army today is very confused. Just what does Your Excellency think about the bomb incident of UGAKI? It is outrageous to speak of such things as an expedition to manchuria-Mongolia, etc., because the troops are the Emperor's and it is unthinkable to move them without an Imperial Order. Just what is your opinion on this?" I, /EGI/ probed here and there, but the Minister only made very obscure replies on the matter of UGAKI. It is a very troublesome thing."

We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-30A, an excerpt relating to the 4th September, 1931. This contradicts MINAMI's statement at pages 19,826-7 denying the conversation with Finance minister INOUE therein set forth.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, we are getting, of course, these references to the record,

and I have no opportunity to check them until after it is too late, but I ask that the Court take the page number given by the prosecution and study it carefully and ascertain for themselves whether it bears out his statement. I object to this as having no probative value and not being important and as being hearsay of the rankest form.

Furthermore, if these two, MINAMI and KOISO, as mentioned in there, were criticizing each other, it would certainly go to meet the prosecution's allegations as to conspiracy. In fact, it may be done officially, assuming, of course, that this document would have probative value.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-10 will receive exhibit No. 3756 for identification only; and the excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document 3150-10A, will receive exhibit No. 3756-A.

(Whereupon, document 3150-10 was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3756 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, document 3150-10A, was marked prosecution

exhibit No. 3756-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"4 September 1931.

*On September 4, I met the Finance minister, INOUE. He said: 'The War minister, /MINAMI/ on the whole, was in complete accord with me on the Army reorganization plan, and the matter was agreed upon between us before we parted. However, upon returning to the War ministry, he was severely criticised by the military Affairs Bureau Chief, KOISO, and the Intendance Section Chief. Consequently, he returned to me later and said: "I previously agreed with you upon the matter, but I found it very difficult to appease the members of the staff" For this reason, the matter has reverted to its starting point."

I offer in evidence IPS document 3150-10B, an excerpt from HARADA's Memoirs found at page 61 relating to the conference HARADA had in the evening of September 12, 1931 with the Vice-Chief of the General Staff NINOMIYA and others, and to the discussion by them of HIRANUMA's proposal to sever diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and of the connection between the leading officers of the Army and the reactionary organization Kokuhon-sha headed by HIRANUMA.

The presentation of this document refutes

=

exhibit No. 3225 containing a description of HIRANUMA's interview with a member of the American Embassy during which HIRANUMA characterized himself as a proponent of the so-called "moral diplomacy" and of the establishment of "a stabilized peace to replace interludes of preparation for the next war." (Record page 29,225).

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, now we have gotten down to the point where we reach a document that the prosecution has introduced which, if there is anything to it at all, clearly invades the province of the Tribunal. It starts out -- he isn't even talking about what he thinks. He starts out and says, "According to what Vice-Chief of the General Staff said, I received the impression ..." and "Baron HIRA-NUMA seems to be ..." A little further, "moreover, it seems that he ..." And then, upon what he thought things appeared to him, he says, "I felt that this indicated."

THE PRESIDENT: We will not hear you further, Colonel Warren. By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceed-

ings were resumed as follows:)

Morse & Whale

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYN'S CANR: We now offer in evidence

IPS document No. 3150-11A, an excerpt relating to 14

September 1931. At record pages 19,821-25, MINAMI

while admitting that TATEKAWA was sent to Mukden by

the General Staff and that he had talked with him before

he went, denied that he or as far as he knew, KOISO

had anything to do with his selection or that he en
trusted TATEKAWA with a letter or order from the Emperor

or anybody else. He said he was merely sent to inves
tigate.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I object, if your Honors please, to -- I have no objection except to the second sentence in the second paragraph as not showing from whom HARADA obtained this information, that it is a mere allegation or a matter of opinion. It starts with the words "In short" and ends with the words "War Minister."

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLIRK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-11 will receive exhibit No. 3757 for identification

only; the excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document 3150-11A will receive exhibit No. 3757-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3757 for identification, the excerpt therefrom being marked prosecution exhibit No. 3757-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading) "14 September 1931.

"On the 14th the War Minister returned from
Gotemba, and immediately had Major General TATEKAWA
deliver a confidential letter to the Commander in Chief
of the Kwantung Army. The content of the confidential
letter was about the warning the War Minister received
from His Majesty on the 11th regarding military discipline, and also about the fact that he was told by His
Majesty to take extra precautions in regard to the
actions of the Army in Manchuria and Mongolia. The Var
Minister transmitted the wishes of His Majesty to the
Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army with the intention of bringing pressure upon him so as to have a stop
put to the various Army schemes in Manchuria and Mongolia

"The incident broke out on the night that
TATEKAWA arrived at Mukden with the confidential letter
from the War Minister. In short, it seems to me that
it was TATEKAWA's plan to have the scheme carried out

the confidential letter from the War Minister. This may be seen from the fact that although at the beginning of the conference of the so-called "ar Councillors, representing the Supreme leaders of the Army, the attitude of the members was very firm. Thereafter, the War Minister conveyed the wishes of His Majesty to the members at the conference, the attitude of the members changed completely. And they decided that the present plans of the Army should be completely abandoned by all means. This appears to have resulted in having the War Minister's confidential letter conveyed to the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army."

Next I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-11B relating to 19 September 1931 and particularly to the dispatch of troops from Korea to Manchuria. At pages 19,843-9 MINAMI was questioned about this and while admitting some parts of it he maintained that he had opposed the dispatch of those troops which this excerpt contradicts.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I wish to object to this on the grounds that I have stated before and on the further ground that it is not only against the best evidence rule but that the prosecution's witnesses WAKATSUKI and

SHIDEHARA have both testified that MINAMI was never opposed to the cabinet's policy at pages 1,564, 1,571, 1,583 and 1,384, and this would allow the prosecution to impeach their own witness by secondary evidence.

And the Premier, WAKATSUKI, mentioned in here is still alive and has been a witness in this case.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-11B will receive exhibit No. 3757-B.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3757-B and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading) "19 September 1931.

"About supper time on the 19th, there was a telephone call from the Premier, and he said: 'I want you to come immediately.' Therefore, I went to the official residence of the Premier after dinner. The Premier appeared very troubled, and he said: 'No reports have been delivered to me by the Foreign Ministry nor the War Minister / T.N. regarding the Manchurian Incident/However, I have told Chief Secretary KAWASAKI to caution them about it. 'I am trying by various means to prevent this incident from spreading, and if possible to settle

2 3 4

7 0

However, it seems that the Army authorities are desirous of making a guarantee occupation. Guarantee occupation is a matter to be decided by the government, and the Army authorities have no power to make decisions regarding such matters. The Chinese military forces in Manchuria exceed 200,000, and at present, the strength of the Japanese Army there is a little over 10,000. I asked what they intended doing if, by acting too outrageously in Manchuria, something should possibly happen against such a huge opnosing force, to which the reply was: "We will send out troops from Korea. Probably troops already have been sent out from Korea." Therefore I remarked, "Isn't it outrageous for the Army to send out troops from Korea without the order from the government?" However, there is a precedent, during the TANAKA ministry troops were moved without Imperial sanction "

Next I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-12A, a series of excerpts dealing with the same matter and bringing it down to September 23rd. MINAMI was questioned on this excerpt at pages 19,850-56, particularly with regard to the question of withholding the expenses for the dispatch of troops. He made some admissions, but in general denied the statements in this excerpt.

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: Objection is made, if your Honors please, on the same grounds, that this is matter that is not evidence that has sufficient probative value to be received.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
3150-12 will receive exhibit No. 3758 for identification
only; the excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document
3150-12A will receive exhibit No. 3758-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3758 for identification, the excerpt therefrom being marked prosecution exhibit No. 3758-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading) "22-3 September, 1931.

Imperial Palace, and reported to the Emperor on the progress of the Cabinet meeting, the substance of which was as follows: To cause an absolute cessation on establishing military administrations, and on seizing customs offices and seizing banks, and the like,

and to forbid all actions excepting those to prevent

risks. The Var Minister made a proposal to send the

Rorea Army to Manchuria. The reason that the War

Minister expressed such a desire was that he had been

hotified by the Chief of the General Staff that the

commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army had made the

demand to the Chief of the General Staff on the ground

of the shortage of strength in Manchuria. The Cabinet

did not approve the proposal in its meeting because

the matter might be taken up by the League of Nations,

and also because upon the withdrawal of the Manchurian

Army there would be difficulty. 'I (Premier) severely

rebuked the Var Minister for sending out troops as far

kirin and Changchun.

"Later on, the 'ar Minister again consulted with the Chief of the General Staff about dispatching the Korea Army, and decided to bring up the matter in the Cabinet meeting of today (the 22nd). Later on, however, the 'ar Minister told the Premier: 'The Commander-in-Chief of the Korea Army decided that the situation was urgent and already has dispatched one brigade.'

__

". . . The War Minister was very anxious to have the dispatching of the Korea Army approved at the Cabinet meeting . . .

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

"At 9:30 a.m. the following morning, the 23d, His Majesty summoned Premier WAKATSUKI. And then, at the Cabinet meeting that day it was decided that the troops having been dispatched anyway, the government should defray the expenses, though the Finance Minister was not actually admitting that the dispatch of troops had been carried out auly in accordance with a Cabinet decision. /It was decided/ at the Cabinet meeting that in view of the fact that the Chief of the General Staff had received a report from the War Ministry that the troops had been dispatched arbitrarily and considering the dispatch had been done, that is, the thing having been done, the government should defray the expenses without raising any objection.

the Throne. the Premier was compelled to report ex-20 actly what had happened to His Majesty and after that 21 .

22 23

24

"During the Cabinet meeting of the same day,

25

Being asked to report exactly what had happened to

the War Minister and the Chief of the General Staff

which had been decided and carried out arbitrarily

presented themselves. And thus, the dispatch of troops

had been submitted for Imperial ex post facto approval.

the words of His Majesty were conveyed to the Cabinet members: 'I believe that the policy that has been cecided by the government of the so-called non-expansion of the Incident is very appropriate. Therefore, endeavour to carry it out completely.'"

I now offer in evidence IPS document Ne.

3150-13A. This was concerned mainly with a report
by MOLISHIMA, Section I Chief Asia Bureau of the Foreign Ministry on his return from a mission to Manchuria,
the whole of which MINAMI denied at pages 19,871-6.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, if this is being introduced purely and simply on the grounds of rebuttal testimony I object to it on that ground. If they are introducing it for some other reason I request that the prosecutor be required to state its importance.

THE PRESIDENT: Tell us why you think it is not important. If we think it isn't important, we will reject it.

LR. WARREN: Well, if your Honor please, undoubtedly at this time whoever wrote this document is taking hearsay evidence of telegrams from the Foreign Ministry or the Overseas Affairs Ministry which the Tribunal already has before it.

The statement that "Colonel DOHILARA is also

and the second of the second

4 5

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

22

24

backing the movement" is without foundation, apparently, although he attempts to quote something that we know he didn't. He couldn't quote it because nowhere has he seen anything that he says he can quote.

After his reference to Colonel DOHJHARA then he starts out with the words "There are others. . ."

Diviously that is his own impression, and he invades the province of this Tribunal in attempting to impress that impression on you.

The second paragraph refers to ruffians of the Tokyo area. I think that the Japanese probably would refer to them as ronin, and it has nothing in the world to do with this case.

The next paragraph he starts out "According to the story of MORISHIMA" and he purports to quote the exact conversation which MORISHIMA is supposed to have had. I submit to this Tribunal that MORISHIMA is still alive and they can bring him in here. Anyway, regardless of that, there isn't anything new in here.

Now, this last paragraph "Whenever they drank"-Oh, yes. Incidentally, with reference to
NISHIHARA, which I have been informed means ISHIHARA,
I am sure that is correct and the prosecutor agrees with
me.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, that is right.

Mr. WARREN: Well, we took his testimony and you have it all before you, and it contradicts this. We we have the testimony of ISHIHAMA concerning all this, at least the presecution had him up there and I am sure they examined him about it. He was their witness.

Mr. COMYNS CARA: No.

MR. WARREN: He was our witness. I am sure they cross-examined him on it. I am sorry, he was our witness.

Then in this last paragraph why he quotes somebody but he doesn't say who. He just puts it as a quote, and he is drawing his own conclusion unquestionably. And then we have this strange thing, these men are going to come over to clear up MITSUI, MITSUBISHI, the Zaibatsu, and I thought up until this time the prosecution was saying that these were diverse unnamed persons, or at least part of these people were in there.

So it boils down that they have covered everything in here. This could be offered only for one
purpose and that would be to impeach the witness, and
to use your Honor's words "We are not concerned with
that now." But I wish the prosecution would concern
themselves with it.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Mattice.

of the accused ITAGAKI, if the Tribunal please.

THE ALESIDENT: We don't want to hear you,

The objections are sustained and the document rejected, by a majority.

IPS document No. 3150-13B, relating to 30th September 1931 and concerning the dispatch of troops to Chientao. MINAMI denied that he had proposed this on page 19,860, but on pages 19,865-9 he admitted that he had made such a proposal but denied that the Premier or the Cabinet had refused permission and said that he approved of the dispatch of those troops by the General Staff from the Korean army.

THE PRESILENT: Captain Brooks.

Mi. BROOKS: Objection is made on the grounds as previously stated, and on the further ground, if your Honors please, that if the prosecution is trying to impeach anyone it is not MINAMI but their own witness WAKATSUKI by secondary evidence.

I wish to also call to the Court's attention that the date 30 September 1931, as I understand it, is the date of the dictation and does not necessarily

7 8

refer to the statement as made in the body.

MR. COMMINS CARR: Your Honor, my friend is mistaken about the date. It is the date to be ascertained from a study of the diary on which the conversation is actually said to have taken place. It is not the date of the dictation.

Mh. BROOKS: That can be referred to the Language Section, if your Honors please, or else the excerpt might be rejected in that it is not full enough and complete enough to the date in with the contents thereof.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
3150-13 will receive exhibit No. 3759 for identification only, and the excerpt therefrom, being prosecution
document 3150-13B will receive exhibit No. 3759-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3759 for identification, the excerpt therefrom being marked prosecution exhibit No. 3759-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARK: (Reading) "30 September,

"After returning, I again met the Premier on other business. The Premier said: 'At the Cabinet meeting, the War Minister repeatedly stressed: "I want to dispatch troops to Chientao." Therefore, I said, 'Absolutely no. If there is any danger, it is better to evacuate the Japanese Nationals!' However, the War Minister retorted: "In case the lives and properties of Japanese residents are endangered, will Your Excellency take the responsibility?" Therefore, I answered: 'That cannot be helped.'

bombings and assaults in Chientao. A Korean who threw the bomb was apprehended and upon investigation, he confessed: 'I did it because I was engaged to do so by Japanese Military.' Such a situation is too dangerous to contemplate."

"After returning, I again met the Promier on other business. The Premier said: 'At the Cabinet meeting, the War Minister repeatedly stressed: "I want to dispatch troops to Chientao." Therefore, I said, 'Absolutely no. If there is any danger, it is better to evacuate the Japanese Nationals!' However, the War Minister retorted: "In case the lives and properties of Japanese residents are endangered, will Your Excellency take the responsibility?" Therefore, I answered: 'That cannot be helped.'

"At a later date, there were incidents and bombings and assaults in Chientao. A Korean who threw the bomb was apprehended and upon investigation, he confessed: 'I did it because I was engaged to do so by Japanese Military.' Such a situation is too dangerous to contemplate."

22 23

Duda & Spratt

I next offer in evidence IPS document
3150-14A, relating to 1 October 1931. This relates
to a proposal in the cabinet that troops should be
withdrawn before a meeting of the League Council in
Geneva and MINAMI's retort that it would be better
to withdraw from the League of Nations. MINAMI
denied the whole of this at pages 19,860-61,

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I object to this on the grounds as previously stated; and for the further reason that SHIDEHARA, the man mentioned here, stated that he was definitely certain that MINAMI never proposed secession from the League of Nations. This is impeaching the witness without showing him the document itself when they have had more than two occasions to do so.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, might I answer that objection? It is rather necessary that I should do so.

It is quite true that SHIDEHARA was called for the prosecution with regard to another matter, but he was called for the defense, and it was in crossexamination of him as a defense witness that he gave the answers to which my friend refers. This excerpt is offered in rebuttal, both of MINAMI's account of

this matter and also of SHIDEHARA's account of it as a defense witness.

MR. BROOKS: The matter was approached when he was a prosecution witness at page 1384 and also at a later date, and I do not see how they could attack a witness's credibility and vouch for it at the same time.

THE PRESIDENT: That applies to both sides here.

By a majority the objection is overruled, and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-14 will receive exhibit No. 3760 for identification only. The excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document No. 3150-14A, will receive exhibit No. 3760-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 376C for identification; and the excerpt therefrom was marked prosecution exhibit 3760-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"1 October 1931.

"In the Cabinet Meeting of the 1st of October, Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA stated that he

To ot the same time. orodibility one vouch for on without thouse at page 1384 and - Populat of It JP, 589 The tapplies to both sides and the document edmitted on the usual terms. 4 By a pajority the objection is overruled, 3150-14 WIII recol vo exhibit No. 3760 for identific 13 CLER OF THE COURT: Prosecution document cation only. The excernt therefrom, being prosecu-14 tion document No. 3150-14A, Will receive exhibit 15 15 No. 3760-A. 1> 18 10 referred to was merked prosecution exhibit 20 No. 376c for identification; and the excerpt 21 therefrom wes marked prosecution exhibit 22 3760-A and received in evidence.) 3 MR. COMMIS CARRI (Teeding) October, Foreign Minister succounts on one too on the the the from we be very ble to mainkden and Kirin. etter for Japan to Prope. 13 cions." withdraw 14 dence IPS document Next 1 15 8 October 1931, which No. 3150-14B, relata 16 records a discussion between the Premier and MINAMI 17 about the possibility of the army setting up an 18 independent government in Manchuria. At pages 19 19,881-8 MINAMI was asked about this matter. He 20 contradicted himself as to whether the conversation 21 took place at all, but definitely denied that he had 22 made the answer attributed to him. 23 MR. BROOKS: Objection is made, if the 24 Tribunal please, on the grounds as previously stated. 25

this matter and also of SHIDEHARA's account of it as a defense witness.

MR. BROOKS: The matter was approached when he was a prosecution witness at page 1384 and also at a later date, and I do not see how they could attack a witness's credibility and vouch for it at the same time.

THE PRESIDENT: That applies to both sides here.

By a majority the objection is overruled, and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-14 will receive exhibit No. 3760 for identification only. The excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document No. 3150-14A, will receive exhibit No. 3760-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 376C for identification; and the excerpt therefrom was marked prosecution exhibit 3760-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"1 October 1931.

"In the Cabinet Meeting of the 1st of October, Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA stated that he

wanted a clarification of attitude before the opening of the Council meeting in Geneva on the 14th. If Japan withdraws troops by that time, there will be no problem. The Foreign Minister further stated that the stationing of troops for the purpose of self-protection is all right. However, the maintenance of more than necessary troops, and the keeping of troops in Kirin and Tungkia is far from good. However, the War Minister said: 'If we withdraw troops now, the situation will be very difficult for us, and we will not be able to maintain control of the situation in Mukden and Kirin. Properly speaking, I believe it better for Japan to withdraw from the League of Nations.'"

No. 3150-14B, relating to 8 October 1931, which records a discussion between the Premier and MINAMI about the possibility of the army setting up an independent government in Manchuria. At pages 19,881-8 MINAMI was asked about this matter. He contradicted himself as to whether the conversation took place at all, but definitely denied that he had made the answer attributed to him.

MR. BROOKS: Objection is made, if the Tribunal please, on the grounds as previously stated.

2 3 4

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I now offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-15-16A, relating to October 22, 1931, again with regard to withdrawal from the League of Nations. MINAMI denied the whole account of this cabinet meeting on pages 19862-5.

MR. BROOKS: The same objection, if your Honors please.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-15-16 will receive exhibit No. 3761 for identification only. The excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document No. 3150-15-16A, will receive exhibit No. 3761-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3761 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3761-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Reading)

"22 October 1931.

"The Premier also complained: 'At today's

4 5

cabinet meeting, the War Minister, MINAMI, Jiro, said an exceedingly outrageous thing. in regard to the League of Nations. He said: "There is no need for paying deference to the League of Nations; there should be no objection to seceding from the League. Should Japan be determined to wage war against the whole world, this (T. N. secession from the League) can be readily done. I'll excuse myself now, because I've been invited to the marriage of Prince RIKEN." And he left the cabinet meeting. I'm really troubled because he is such an irresponsible person. ""

I now offer in evidence IPS document No. 3150-31-32A, in rebuttal of ARAKI's refusal to confirm that Drs. TATE and Batey were consulted by the Japanese Government (page 28,353, second question and answer thereto), that their advice was before the cabinet to which ARAKI belonged (page 28,353, third question and answer thereto), and that . their advice was that the proposed establishment of Manchukuo by Japan would be contrary to international law (page 28,355, first question, second answer).

MR. McMANUS: If the Tribunal pleases, the Dr. TATE referred to here is also known as Dr. TASHI, and he has published a book entitled,

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Current Problems of International Law." On page 136 of that book there is a direct contradiction to what is stated here in this excerpt. It is very brief, if the Court pleases, and I shall quote it:

"If the self-defensive action in Manchuria resulted in assistance to the separation movement that is not a violation of the Nine-Power Treaty."

Now, if the Tribunal wishes or would permit surrebuttal in this case, I should only be too happy to produce that book and render it to the Court for whatever assistance the Tribunal may desire.

I object to the document.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this is the first I have heard of this gentleman being the same person as the author of the book with a different name, and we have only my friend's word for that.

THE PRESIDENT: Not evidence. What is the point of this excerpt, Mr. Carr?

MR. COMYNS CARR: To show that it was known to the Japanese authorities that the action which they in fact took was by their own advisers stated to be contradictory to international haw.

THE PRESIDENT: What particular accused's mind is revealed by this?

3

6

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19 20

21

22

24

IR. COLYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission, it is clear from the last sentence that the
acvice must have been before the cabinet, and, therefore,
every member of the cabinet, including ARAKI, must have
known it.

THE PRESIDENT: He may not have accepted it so that we can say that he had a guilty mind. This can only go to the state of mind of the accused, and what accused? And what does it prove about the state of mind of any accused?

LR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the matter is entirely in the hands of the Tribunal. I have said all I have to say about it.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

IR. COLYNS CARR: I now offer in evidence

IPS document No. 3150-31-32B, in rebuttal of (1) ARAMI's

denial of having told Finance Minister TAKAHASHI that

in order to recover its prestige, the army must be sent

to Shanghai to shoot, page 28,344, first question and

answer thereto; and (2) his refusal to admit saying

that if the Chinese did not retreat twenty kilometres

he would continue to batter, page 28,343, last question

and answer thereto.

THE PRESIDENT: I'r. I'cl'anus.

2.

LR. ICMANUS: I offer the same objection, if the Tribunal pleases, and call to the attention of the Court that, of course, this testimony is hearsay. Ind if Mr. TAKAHASHI can claim more credibility than official documents, why, that is a matter for the Tribunal; and if there will be a surrebuttal, I am sure that I can produce those official documents.

I object to the document; I ask the Court to reject it. However, if the Tribunal will receive it, I request the entire document be read, and particularly the last two lines.

THE PRESIDENT: Fr. Carr, do you wish to say anything?

MR. COMYNS CARR: No, your Honor, except to say that in this case I happen to know that Finance Minister TAKAHASHI is dead.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I offer in evidence IPS document 3150-31-320, relating to 21 February 1932 and to SHIRATORI's statement attacking the policy of Foreign l'inister YOSHIZAWA and urging the appointment of a new Foreign l'inister, made in the course of a dinner with Baron HARADA and others.

This document is offered to contradict

12

10

13

16

15

17

19

20

21

23

24

SHIRATORI's denial on cross-examination at page 35,080 that he opposed the policy of Foreign Minister YOSHIZAWA, and his denial at page 35,081 that he had ever urged the dismissal of YOSHIZAWA and the appointment of Vice-Foreign Minister NAGAI in his place.

I'R. BROOKS: If your Honor please, SHIRATORI's counsel is not present in court. I do not know whether he would wish an objection to be made or not, so I am not proposing to make it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there are no objections 10 before us. We cannot take an objection except against 12 repetitive documents.

PR. LOGAN: We have a general objection, if 14 the Tribunal please, but in view of the conspiracy count, I will take an objection to the document.

FR. COLYNS CARR: Your Honor, perhaps I might just say that the matter is more important as going to 17 SHIRATORI's credibility than for the inherent importance of the subject matter.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection 20 is sustained and the document rejected.

22 MR. COMYNS CARR: I now offer in evidence IPS 23 document No. 3150-36A, in rebuttal of ARAKI's failure 25 to confirm that, at a cabinet meeting on about 11 Warch 1932, it was decided that, as the proposed establishment

of l'anchukuo might be a violation of the Nine-Power Pact, recognition should, at least on the surface, be postponed, page 28,355, first and last questions, and answer to latter, continuing on page 28,356.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: I object to the document, if the Tribunal pleases, and I call particular attention to the next to the last line, which states that there was an original and corrected plan. I contend, if the Tribunal pleases, that this evidence is valueless unless that original and corrected plan should accompany this document.

Furthermore, I point out to the Tribunal that it is merely a hearsay discussion of a cabinet meeting by a private person who did not attend such meeting.

I also point out to the Tribunal that this particular document will serve to prove that there was no fixed plan prepared beforehand with regard to an independent Manchuria, but that the government made plans accordingly as they developed because of the situation on the spot. Therefore, your Honors might determine that there wasn't any conspiracy at all.

However, I formally object to the reception of the document.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal,

21.

if my friend thinks the document helps him, I do not understand why he objects. But with regard to the two objections he has taken--

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3150-36 will receive exhibit No. 3762 for identification only. The excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document 3150-36A, will receive exhibit No. 3762-A.

(Whereupon, prosecution document
No. 3150-36 was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 3762 for identification. Prosecution
document No. 3150-36A was marked prosecution's
exhibit No. 3762-A and received in evidence.)

R. COLYNS CARR: (Reading) "About 11 March

1932.

over until Saturday. The decision on the ManchurianMongolian policy which was the topic of the InterMinistry Conference (Army, Navy, Foreign Affairs, and
Finance) was reached and was placed before the Cabinet
meeting on Friday. At this meeting, various problems
were encountered. Among them was the soon to be formed
'New Nation' problem, if this were to be looked upon

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

3.

-3

as a violation of the Nine-Power Pact it would be an unsatisfactory state of affairs, then at least on the surface, its recognition should be postponed for the time being. However, if Chang Hsuen-liang acts as an insurgent against the 'New Nation' and sends punitive troops, it will not be able to quell the rebellion because the 'New Nation' has no army. Therefore, in order somehow to safeguard the 'New Nation' the Japanese Army must repel the attack. At the time of the Feng-Chili War /T.N. Civil war between the Feng-Tient Regime and the Chili Regime/ the Japanese Army under the guise of a Manchurian peace preservation force, was on the alert. The problem whether or not we may do the same as in that case raised so much trouble that the Cabinet meeting was carried over to Saturday.

"The demands of the Army, to a certain extent, from various standpoints, were repulsed /for the present/. Having obtained the inside story from the Navy Minister, I showed the original and corrected plans to the Prince on Monday..."

We will adjourn until half-past nine on Monday next.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment

was taken until Monday, 19 January 1948, at

В

0930.)